DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 838 FL 020 975

AUTHOR Georgakopoulou, Alexandra
TITLE Participant Reference in Greek Personal Experience Narratives.
REPORT NO ISSN-0959-2253
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 15p.; For serial issue in which this paper appears, see FL 020 971.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Edinburgh Working Papers in Linguistics, n3 p36-48 1992

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Processes; Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; *Greek; Oral Language; *Personal Narratives; Uncommonly Taught Languages; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS *Referents (Linguistics)

ABSTRACT

This paper, based on the analysis of forty oral and forty written personal experience narratives elicited from the same subjects for two different audiences, explores the shaping of participant reference with respect to considerations of audience and the effect of modality. The discussion first focuses on the impact of cognitive constraints on the referential patterning of the data and then turns to the discourse factors/functions that trigger nominal reference in the narratives at hand. Of these functions, evaluation is particularly stressed for its role in the elicitation of explicit forms of reference. What this paper mainly shows is that the contextual parameters of audience and modality play a crucial role in the functioning of the factors discussed that underlie referential choices: these are modeled on the narrators' schemata about their intended audiences and are also affected by the change of modality. (Contains 34 references.) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353838

Participant Reference in Greek Personal Experience Narratives.

Alexandra Georgakopoulou(DAL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Brian Parkinson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 020 845

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PARTICIPANT REFERENCE IN GREEK PERSONAL EXPERIENCE NARRATIVES

Alexandra Georgakopoulou (DAL)

Abstract

This paper, based on the analysis of forty oral and forty written personal experience narratives elicited from the same subjects for two different audiences, explores the shaping of participant reference with respect to considerations of audience and the effect of modality. The discussion first focuses on the impact of cognitive constraints on the referential patterning of the data and then turns to the discourse factors/functions that trigger nominal reference in the narratives at hand. Of these functions evaluation is particularly stressed for its role in the elicitation of explicit forms of reference. What this paper mainly shows is that the contextual parameters of audience and modality play a crucial role in the functioning of the factors discussed that underlie referential choices: these are modelled on the narrators' schemata about their intended audiences and are also affected by the change of modality.

1. Introduction

The discussion in this paper isolates one aspect of the complex phenomenon of referential patterning in discourse, namely that of participant tracking. The term covers the set of referential patterns and devices by which the characters of a text are introduced, re-identified and established in the "universe" of the discourse. The data on which the discussion is based comprises eighty personal experience narratives in Greek elicited from twenty subjects from a comparable social and educational background. Each subject of the experiment related four short stories with the same topic (an unpleasant first-hand experience), for two different audiences (adults and children) and in both oral and written form. Given the above description of the data, it follows that participant tracking in this case is looked at comparatively along the axes of modality (medium) and audience. In fact, unlike most previous comparative research on aspects of discourse anaphora, which is based on texts from different languages or genres (e.g. see Clancy 1980, papers in Grimes (ed.) 1978 and in Hinds (ed.) 1978), this paper investigates the factors that underlie referential choice as regards the narratives' participants from the perspective of the texts' mode of delivery and recipient design.

The definition of the term participant was a problematic enterprise to start with. Initially, it was designed to involve only the third-person human referents, but text analysis showed the need for the extension of the term to include animals or objects that are projected as animate (car and motorcycle are the only two instances of such objects in the data). The basic criterion that these categories should fulfill in order to be treated as participants was a functional role in the plot development which was tapped in the analysis by a number of elements (e.g. association with dynamic verbs, interaction with other characters, role in the narrative's causal relations etc).

EDINBURGH WORKING PAPERS IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS, number 3 (1992) ISSN 0959-2253

2. Referential choice in the literature: The cognitive and discourse factors interface

Attempts in the literature to identify the factors underlying the choice between explicit (nominal reference) and inexplicit forms of reference (pronominal reference, elliptical reference or zero-anaphora) have led to the recognition of two major categories of factors: cognitive factors and discourse factors. The former category explains referential choice in terms of constraints that apply on both the addresser's and the addressee's cognitive abilities, whereas the latter comprises discourse structures and functions involved in the making up of a text's anaphoric patterning. In particular, an approach to reference based on cognitive factors would account for the choice of an explicit vs an inexplicit form of reference in terms of quantitative evidence as regards its distance to the last mention of the referent and the intervening referents (risk of ambiguity). Alternatively, looking for the discourse factors that affect reference would involve the qualitative study of macro-level devices (strategies) and functions of the discourse structure.

Different researchers have emphasised one or other category of factors. A typical example of emphasis on the cognitive considerations that surround any referential choice is Givon's work (1983: 17ff) which measures the impact of cognitive constraints on referential choice in terms of referential distance (distance between two mentions of a referent), persistence of a coreferential form in the subsequent context and ambiguity (presence of other entities which might be candidates for reference).

A series of works on discourse anaphora have tried to show that cognitive-oriented approaches to reference such as Givon's are inadequate because they 'assume that discourse is made up of an undifferentiated string of clauses which follow one another in time but do not form larger units that could perform communicative function in relation to one another' (Fox, 1987b: 158). Here one can cite the work of Hinds (1978), Grimes (1978), Clancy (1980) and Fox (1987a, 1987b) which use narratives as their data, and draw attention to the association between discourse factors and participant reference, because, as their data suggests, 'time and interference cannot account for all referential choices' (Clancy, 1980: 143). For instance, as Fox argues (1987), they cannot account for cases in which 'something like eleven clauses separate the two mentions of a character and yet the second mention is done with a pronoun' (161), contrary to any predictions made about the role of distance.

Studies as the above propose the following discourse factors as responsible for the choice between explicit and inexplicit forms of reference: demarcation of discourse units (e.g. episodes/paragraphs), world-shifts or shifts from one mode of narration to another (e.g. from the on the-event-line to the off the event-line) and relations between the participants (mainly characters' plot centrality). In line with the above mentioned literature, the first thing which the close study of the sample at hand showed as regards referential choice in the narratives, is that it cannot be adequately dealt with in an approach relying only on cognitive factors. The neglect of the role of discourse factors in the forms of participant reference employed in the narratives would result in a limited and impoverished account of the rationale underlying the final anaphoric patterning of the texts. This paper supports the view that any instance of referential choice is the complex outcome of more than one interacting cognitive and discourse factors and that it should be treated as such.

3. Forms of reference in Greek

Before the discussion proceeds, a note has to be made about the options available in the Greek system of referring. Greek, being a pro-drop language, differs from languages like English which basically rely on nominal and pronominal reference, in that it employs ellipsis or zero-anaphora[1]. This happens because it is possible to delete the subject of a sentence altogether if its identity is recoverable from the context: e.g. "I Maria ihe idhi thimosi arketa. Etsi efighe" ("Maria had already become very angry. So (literally) left", not "she left", as it would be in English). Thus, subject pronominal reference is an intermediate form of reference in terms of explicitness, more explicit than ellipsis, which is the ordinary form of attenuated reference, and less explicit than full noun phrases (NPs). In terms of markedness, subject pronouns also stand midway along the markedness continuum: when ellipsis is expected or permitted, the choice of a pronoun is marked, but less marked than the choice of an NP. The system of referential forms in Greek also comprises clitics which function as the most attenuated form of reference in cases of object referents, with stressed pronouns and full NPs being the other two more explicit alternatives: e.g. "Tu ipa" (lit: him[clitic] I said), "Ipa s'afton" (I said to him: pronoun), "Ipa ston patera mu" (I said to my father: NP).

4. Referential choice in the data: An overview of cognitive constraints

To be able to "compute" the impact of cognitive constraints on referential choice in the sample, the analysis followed Clancy (1980), in that it tried to identify the effect of time and interference in the distribution of coreferential forms in the data on the basis of three measurements: i) the number of idea units[2] separating two mentions of the same referent, ii) the number of sentences separating the two mentions, and iii) the number of other referents intervening between the two referents. In these measurements number "0" indicates re-mention of the referent in the same idea unit or sentence, while number "1" indicates that the second mention of the referent takes place in the idea unit or sentence immediately following the one with the first mention: e.g.

> O babas mu pada ehi provlima me ta nosokomia/ ke the beni pote mesa [ellipsis for "o babas mu": 1(idea unit), 0(sentences), 0(referents)]/ ki ine i mama pu pada sinodhevi/ ke thimame oti kathotan ekso [ellipsis for "o babas mu": 2(idea units), 0(sentences), 1(referent)]... (My dad always has a problem with hospitals/ and never enters them [ellipsis for "my dad": 1(idea unit), 0(sentences), 0(referents)]/ and it's my mother who always escorts/ and I remember that [lit: was sitting] he was sitting outside [ellipsis for "my dad": 2(idea units), 0(sentences), 1(referent))
>
> (Virginia F., oral SA)

The first remark to be made about the frequency of the referential forms with respect to the three measures selected in the data is that inexplicit forms of reference present a higher concentration in "0" and "1" than explicit forms of reference do. Obviously, this is due to the greater constraints exercised upon them by the cognitive factors of time and interference. The evidence for this is that ellipsis, the most attenuated form of reference, normally occurs in all types of narratives and with striking regularity within the immediately following idea unit or same sentence as the last mention of the referent or

with no intervening referents (see Table 1a for the percentages of ellipsis in these positions).

Table 1a: Ellipsis

	a. idea units	b. sentences	c. referents
	1	0	0
OSsA	71	80	66
OSsC	76	76	78
WSsA	87	67	88
WSsC	88	66	81

Pronouns, being a less attenuated form of reference than ellipsis, tolerate more the lapse of idea units, sentences and referents: they are almost equally distributed between the positions 1 and 2-4 as regards the lapse of idea units; the great majority of them also occur either within the same sentence or after the passage of one sentence from the last mention of the referent and either with no intervening referents or after one referent (see Table 1b).

Table 1b: Pronouns

	a. idea units	b. sentences	c. referents
	1 : 2-4	0 : 1	0 : 1
OSsA	41 : 50	70 : 26	37 : 56
OSsC	51 : 40	67 : 29	46 : 48
WSsA	62 : 33	41 : 44	55 : 38
WSsC	67 : 25	56 : 44	48 : 50

NPs, being the most explicit referential form, are the ones on which the least cognitive constraints are exerted. This is why they normally occur after two-to-four idea units or one sentence after the last mention of the referent or with at least one intervening referent (see Table 1c).

Table 1c: Noun Phrases

	a. idea units	b. sentences	c. referents
	1: 2-4	1: 2-4	1
OSsA	11 : 31	39 : 35	32
OSsC	28 : 39	54 : 20	44
WSsA	21 : 37	48 : 34	42
WSsA	10 : 43	39 : 41	42

In terms of the functioning of cognitive factors in each modality, the general tendency for all forms of reference is to exhibit a concentration of greater percentages between the numbers "0" and "4" in written narratives than in oral ones. Put in another way, in comparison to oral narratives, more referential forms, both explicit and inexplicit, occur closer to their antecedents in written narratives. The implication of this distribution is that the influence of cognitive constraints is stronger in written modality than it is in oral modality. Therefore, this finding corroborates the standard view in the literature that written language is less tolerant of ambiguities than oral language and that it opts more for explicitness (Olson 1977), because of its "decontextualized" (Kay 1977) or

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"detached" (Chafe 1982) nature (i.e. independence of external context, lack of paralanguage, absence of the addressee)[3].

The finding is also in accordance with what happens in the data in terms of the frequency of referential forms. Without going into the matter in detail here, it suffice to say that the oral narratives at hand present a greater percentage of inexplicit referential forms whereas written narratives rely more on explicit forms of reference. Thus, the data suggest that, unlike the view expressed by Mazzie (1987) that textual implicitness or explicitness as a result of referential choice is connected with other variables (e.g. content) than modality, explicitness in reference is definitely related to the medium. However, the results of the data analysis also demonstrate the need to take into account other determinants as well (in our case the intended audience), in order to provide an adequate explanation of the phenomenon. In fact, audience considerations and the sender-receiver relationship override the effect of modality in certain cases in the data. Specifically, written SsC (stories for children) at first glance act in an "irregular" way, as regards nominal reference: whereas oral SsC, as compared to oral SsA (stories for adults) exhibit a greater percentage of explicit reference and a greater proportion of NPs closer to their antecedents, presumably to facilitate the children's task of deciphering the referent, written SsC do not follow this pattern. Instead, they act in the opposite way in relation to their corresponding written SsC. They also do not manifest the stronger effect of written modality as compared to oral modality in eliciting more nominal reference in less distance from the last mention of a referent, as happens in the written SsA (see again Tables 1(a-b-c) for the above discussion).

This "unpredictable" behaviour, in addition to being an instance of audience accommodation overriding the modality effect, illustrates the inadequacy of cognitive factors in accounting for certain choices in the referential patterning. The same sort of "unpredictable" behaviour underlies the phenomenon of switch reference (a character is mentioned again in the narrative in subject position following an idea unit or sentence that has a different subject referent) in the data (no numbers are given here). This combined with the general qualitative analysis of the data led to an explanation of the phenomenon which inevitably takes discourse factors into account.

In particular, the whole question has to do with the discourse structure of demarcating units and the strategies employed in the data with respect to it. There are two general discourse strategies that shape participant reference within the same paragraph (for a discussion of the concept see section 5) in the narratives at hand. The first strategy favours strong demarcation of the passage to a new micro-level discourse unit such as that of an idea unit or a sentence and structures discourse so as to comprise clearly indicated breaks in content and changes in the course of actions; presumably, its application triggers explicit forms of reference (example 1 below). The second strategy avoids marking these breaks for the sake of providing a sense of cohesion and continuity in discourse and of presenting the narrative as a chain of conjoinable and closely linked actions: (example 2 below) e.g.

> 1. Ghiafto **o laghos mas** iche ghini axiotheato ghia olus osus mas episkeptodan./ Ti froditha **tu laghu** tin iche analavi i mitera mu./ Oli mas nomizame oti **o laghos** pernuse kala koda mas./ Omos telika apodhihtike oti **o laghos** perimene tin efkeria na dhrapetefsi. (That's why **our hare** had become a sight for all those who visited us./ My mother had taken over the care of **the hare**./ All of us thought that **the**

hare was having a good time with us./ But it finally turned out that **the hare** was waiting for a chance to escape.)

(Bessi F., written SA)

2. **I mitera mu** katevike ghrighora ghrighora tis skales ghia na ton prolavi/. Vghike omos apo tin porta tu garaz/ ke kathos etrehe ghlistrise pano sti laspi./ Epese kato./ Htipise ke ponese poli/ ki arhise na fonazi ke na klei./ Mazeftikan ghitones/ ke prospathusan na tin voithisun na sikothi apo kato./ Egho tromaxa apo tis fones/ ki etrexa na dho ti simveni./ Fonaze oti ihe spasi to heri tis.
(**My mother** quickly ran down the stairs to catch him./ But **she [lit: ellipsis]** went out the garage door/ and as **she [ellipsis]** was running **she [ellipsis]** slipped on the mud./ **She [ellipsis]** fell./ **She [ellipsis]** was badly hurt/ and she [ellipsis] started shouting and crying./ Neighbours arrived/ and tried to help her stand up./ I was startled by the shouts/ and ran to see what was happening./ She [ellipsis] was shouting that she [ellipsis] had broken her hand.)

(Aggeliki K., written SC)

The data analysis shows that written SsA opt for the first strategy to meet the explicitness requirement of written modality, but written SsC favour the second strategy and thus achieve a sense of parataxis, sequentiality and oral-like character to suit the young audience. By contrast, as will be shown in section 5, SsC abandon this policy when it comes to the demarcation of macro-level discourse units (paragraph boundaries).This difference between SsA and SsC in the preference over these two strategies, in addition to showing the inadequacy of cognitive factors for global explanations of the referential patterning, manifests the need to take audience considerations into account as well: in our case, the difference is mainly a matter of different priorities set by the tellability requirement[4] for the different audiences.

5. Discourse factors and participant tracking

One noticeable thing in the analysis of the data is the use of nominal reference for characters that have already been introduced in the discourse. The choice is marked, since the unmarked referential form for this case is that of ellipsis. Close study of the data showed that this phenomenon cannot be thoroughly accounted for only in terms of cognitive constraints. Without going as far as to say that participant tracking in the data is solely dependent on discourse factors, this section simply attempts to draw certain regularities in the relation between the phenomenon investigated and the shaping of discourse structure, as these are identified in the data: put in other words, it focuses on those discourse factors that co-occur with and/or trigger this kind of nominal reference. To be specific, three such discourse factors (functions) were identified in the data:

1. The demarcation of paragraphs or episodes. Here, the two terms are used interchangeably to refer to a meso-level discourse unit that constitutes a coherent section of text within which there is unity of theme or action in the specified spatiotemporal setting[5] . In our data, the use of nominal reference with or without a shift of participant focus at paragraph boundaries functions as a major signal of paragraph marking (for the same view see Stark 1988): e.g.

a. **To ena pedhi** ... itan anesthito/ itan katakitrino/ poli ashima i opsi/ fenotan ghia nekro/. Telika tin epomeni mera/ mathame oti **to pedhi** ihe pethani... (**One child** was unconscious/ he[ellipsis] was very pale/ his face looked awful/ he[ell] looked dead/. Finally the next day/ we heard that **the child** had died...)

(Vivi K., oral SA)

In this example the passage to the resolution of the narrative is signalled by, among others, the device of nominal reference for the character focused upon[6].

b. Thimame pos itan[ell: **afti i kiria**] pada sto plevro mas/... ke [ell]prospathuse na mas kani na niothume efxarista/. Sigha-sigha pernusan ta xronia/ ke kapote ematha pos **afti i kiria** arrostise/ ke malista ashima. (I remember how she[ell. for **"this woman"**] was always at our side/... and she[ell] tried to make us feel good/. Gradually the years went by/ and then I heard that **this woman** fell ill/ and (she was) quite badly).

(Jiannis B., written SC)

c. Nomiza oti ghenika itan asfalis o frahtis/ oti **o skilos** dhe tha boruse na vghi ekso/... lipon meta **o skilos** ksafnika efighe/ apomakrinthike (I thought that the fence was pretty safe/ that **the dog** wouldn't be able to get out/... well afterwards **the dog** suddenly left/ went away...)

(Antonis M., oral SA)

2. The shift from the storyworld, the world of the characters, to the non-storyworld, the world of the external narrator, in the form of background commentary. e.g:

a. Dhistixos **i mihani** dhen ipirhe eki./ Mu tin ihan klepsi./ Ekini tin epohi **i mihani** ghia mena simene ena soro praghmata... (Unfortunately **the motorbike** was not there./ They had stolen it from me./ At that time **the motorbike** meant quite a lot to me...)

(Takis G., written SA)

b. ... **"ton papa"**/ ton adherfo tu/ o opios then ipirxe pote dhexios o **papas**/ itan aristeros/ oxi aristeros alla venizelikos/ **"ton papa** ton ehune filaki?"/ Praghmati ton ixane piasi/ ke ton ixan pai stis filakes tu Milonopulu **ton papa**... (**"the priest"**/ his brother/ who had never been right wing [lit: who... **the priest**: resumption]/ he was on the left/ not on the left but a Venizelian [political faction]/ "do they have the priest in prison?" [lit: the priest him[clitic] they have in prison?] Indeed they had arrested him[clitic]/ and they had put the priest in prison [lit: and him[clitic] they had put in prison the priest]...)

(Hristos C., oral SA)

c. Vlepo ke ton patera mu/ itane ena horisma psilo/ itane ki pera sa baso/ sikonete o pateras mu (I also see my father/ there was a tall partition/ it was there like a small wall/ my father gets up)[7]

(Hristos C., oral SA)

3. The evaluative function of the narratives, that is, the devices by which a story is presented as tellable (see note 4). In particular, two kinds of evaluation mainly favour the passage to explicit reference in the data: a. Instances of wholly external evaluation or of more embedded evaluation in the form of results of high-point (peak) action; these are classified together because they point to the external narratorial voice through devices such as explicit comment on the story's event, suspension of the action and/or reference to or interpretation of the characters' internal states (reactions, emotions etc.). b. Two internal evaluative devices[8], namely instances of shift to direct speech and of evaluative repetition:[9] e.g.

i) External evaluation

a. ... Me tipote dhe sinerhete[**ell: to pedhi**]/ ihe arhisi na melaniazi/ ihe hasi tis esthisis tis/ itan shedhon pethameno **to pedhi**
(... It is impossible to bring it[**ell. for "the child"**] to/ it had started becoming blue/ it had lost consciousness/ **the child** was almost dead [lit. word-order: was ...the child]

(Thomas H., oral SA)

b. Mathame oti **afti i ghineka** ihe arostisi ashima/... ke i katastasi hirotereve./ Stenohorithika para poli/ ghiati imuna poli sindhedhemenos m'**afti ti ghineka**...
(We heard that **this woman** had fallen very ill/... and the situation was becoming worse./ I was very worried/ because I was very attached to **this woman**...)

(Jiannis B., oral SA)

c. Vjenun exo/ ton pernune/ arhizi ekini **i mana mu** na klei/ na odhirete/ na htipiete... (They go out/ they take him with them/ my mum starts crying/ mourning/ beating herself...)

(Hristos C., oral SA)

ii) Direct speech

a. "Nikoli ti simveni?"/ akuo ton patera me mia foni alliotiki/... Ke tote rihnete o thios stin agalia tu patera/ ke lei/ "Panaghioti, i Eleni pethane" ("Nikoli what's the matter?"/ I hear father saying in an unusual tone of voice/... And then uncle falls into father's arms/ and says/ "Panaghioti, Eleni died")

(Athina X., written SA)

This example is a classical example of nominal reference at the peak of the narrative used for both the person to whom the direct speech utterance belongs and for the character encoded in the utterance (person who is the subject or topic of the reported text, or to whom the utterance is addressed).

b. Ftanun sto **Spiro** pia/ ftasane sto **Spiro** pu leghame oti tha tus ekane kapsonia/ eleftheri **tus lei o Spiros**/ o Pireotis o atimos/ fighete Finally they get to **Spiro**/ they got to **Spiro** who we thought would give them a hard time/ you're free **says Spiros**/ that rascal from Piraeus/ go away

(Ilias G., oral SA)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The first and the second of the above factors (demarcation of units, background commentary) have already been discussed in the literature (Clancy 1980, Fox 1987b, Grimes 1978) as favouring shift to explicit reference. The factor of evaluation which is projected in the data at hand as triggering nominal reference is not irrelevant to the other two. In fact, all three factors have something in common: they all constitute departures from the locally established textual norms. The passage to a new paragraph constitutes a departure from the established spatiotemporal location, participant focus and event-schema; evaluation as defined lately in the literature (see Polanyi 1985) is nothing more but a foregrounding of certain aspects of the narration through the technique of deviating from the text's established style; finally, the breaking of the storyline for background commentary constitutes a departure from the established mode of narration, that is, a shift of footing (Goffman, 1981). Therefore, on the basis of this common element we can form a principle which says that in terms of discoursal factors the use of nominal reference for a character already introduced is favoured by structures which signal a departure from the locally established textual norms.

Looking at the percentages of coreferential NPs in the data which relate to each of the factors discussed above (see Table 2), the first interesting thing to notice is the much higher percentage of evaluative repetition of nominal reference in the SsC rather than in the SsA. This finding can be associated with similar findings in the literature, according to which both discourse for children and from children greatly depends on extensive repetition as a principle of discourse organization (e.g. see papers in Ervin-Tripp and Mitchell-Kernan 1977 (eds) and in Ochs and Schieffelin (eds) 1979). In our case, the evaluative functioning of repetition is a stylistic device driven by the relevant schema (script)[10] available in the narrators' minds about stories for children.

As regards the correlation between the other two types of evaluation and nominal reference, they both favour nominal reference in the SsA rather than in the SsC, since the latter, as just mentioned, make more use of the device of repetition from the discussed devices of the evaluative metastructure (the issue of what other implications one could draw from this distribution about the evaluative element in Greek storytelling has to remain beyond the scope of this discussion).

Table 2: Paragraph demarcation, background comments, and evaluation

	Paragraph Demarcation	Background Comments
OSsA	40.0	11.4
OSsC	22.4	8.6
WSsA	38.4	11.8
WSsA	46.2	9.2

	Evaluation		
	a. External	b. Direct Speech	c. Eval. Repetition
OSsA	11.4	12.8	11.4
OSsC	8.6	1.0	51.0
WSsA	11.8	17.7	3.0
WSsA	9.2	1.1	31.5

In accordance with the series of findings so far outlined in the paper showing that adherence to ellipsis is a more "orality-associated" strategy, while explicit reference meets the increase of explicitness required of written narratives, is the higher proportion of shift to explicit reference at paragraph boundaries in the written narratives, both SsA and SsC. This finding also shows that the discourse unit of the paragraph is more powerful in the written SsC in eliciting nominal reference than that of a sentence (see discussion above in section 4.). Written SsC seem to be neatly organized around employing the "thematic strategy" (ellipsis for the character in focus, see the collection of papers in Grimes 1978) within the same paragraph and drastically marking the change of participant focus at paragraph boundaries with nominal reference.

7. Conclusions

This paper has lent support to the view that a focus on cognitive factors alone cannot provide with a thorough and explanatorily adequate description of discourse reference. The major evidence for this was that, despite any exigencies in the Greek language and any language-specific constraints, the results of the analysis were to a great extent congruent with those of previous studies in terms of both the cognitive and discourse factors that elicit explicit or inexplicit forms of reference and of their effect on the referential patterning of a text. Thus, this paper by providing evidence that factors presented in the literature as responsible for certain referential choices in various languages are also valid in the genre of Greek narratives, contributes to the line of research that attempts to establish a set of universal factors underlying referential choice.

The analysis also suggested that participant reference can serve as a point of departure for examining the relation between oral and written discourse; it also exhibited the need for any study of reference to take into account the nature of the intended audience of any discourse and the addresser's assumptions (schemata) about them. In the area of discourse factors, the paper emphasized the role of evaluation in the referential patterning, a factor which has been neglected in the existing literature, though in the data at hand it proved itself to be a powerful discoursal and stylistic mechanism for the elicitation of explicit reference.

Cross-cultural studies have shown that the evaluation requirement is a universal fundamental of storytelling but the devices by which it is actualized and the means by which it is shaped are to a great extent culturally determined (e.g. see Tannen 1979, 1980, 1986). In accordance with this culture-specificity of tellability, it might be the case that the special role which it plays in the participant reference in the data at hand is related to its specific status and conventional ways of realization in the Greek narrative.

Notes

1. Of these two terms, *ellipsis* describes the situation in Greek better, so it is adopted throughout the paper.

2. The basic unit of analysis used in the data analysis was the idea unit (for a discussion of the concept see Chafe 1980). Throughout this paper the examples given are broken up into idea units; the symbol "/" signals end of an idea unit.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. The issue is much more complicated in the relevant literature than is presented here, due to the highly contradictory findings so far. However, a detailed discussion of the matter is beyond the scope of this paper. For a review of the literature see Biber (1988).

4. The tellability or evaluation requirement refers to the need to provide the audience with an interesting and worth-telling story by stating and enhancing its point so that the "So what?" question arising in all cases of storytelling is answered (see Labov 1972, Polanyi 1985).

5. For a discussion of the terms and of the differences perceived between them by different linguists see Hinds (1977), Longacre (1979, 1983), van Dijk (1983).

6. Notice the relation between paragraphs and the identified parts of a narrative such as peak, resolution etc. As Longacre (1983) puts it, paragraphs constitute the lexemic organization of a narrative on which the categories of its semantic organization are mapped. The beginning of a paragraph in examples b and c for instance signals the turning point of the narrative. In these examples also notice elements such as motion verbs (change of event-schema) and temporal adverbials.

7. Example c differs from examples a and b in that here the background comment does not contain any mention of the participant; in the other two cases, the participant is referred to in both worlds (on the-event-line, off the-event-line) and nominally re-introduced in the storyline when the shift to the comment ends.

8. According to Labov (1972), there are two kinds of evaluation, external and internal. The former refers to the case of the narrator breaking the flow of the narrative and telling the addressee what the point of the story is, whereas the latter signal the point of the story by devices embedded in the action. 9. In Polanyi's terms repetition is "deictic" evaluation, which means that the evaluation of information is encoded in one clause by devices realized in other clauses (1985: 23). Due to this macro-level function of repetition, there is no example provided of evaluative repetition in this paper (reason of space limitations).

10. The literature on these concepts is already vast. For a classical discussion see Rumelhart (1975) and Schank and Abelson (1977). Also see Tannen (1979).

References

Biber D. 1988. Variation across Speech and Writing. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Blount B.G. and M. Sanches. (eds.) 1977. Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change. New York: Academic Press.

Chafe W. 1980. 'The deployment of consciousness in the production of a narrative' in Chafe (ed.) 1980: 9-50.

Chafe W. 1982. 'Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and literature' in Tannen (ed.) 1982: 35-54.

Chafe W. (ed.) 1980. The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production. New Jersey: Ablex.

Clancy P. 1980. 'Referential choice in English and Japanese narrative discourse' in Chafe (ed.) 1980: 127-202.

van Dijk T.A. 1984. 'Episodes as units of discourse analysis' in Schiffrin (ed.) 1984: 177-95.

Ervin-Tripp S. and C. Mitchell-Kernan (eds) 1977. Child Discourse. New York: Academic Press.

Fox B. 1987a. Discourse Structure and Anaphora. Written and Conversational English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fox B. 1987b. 'Anaphora in popular written English narratives' in Tomlin (ed.) 1987: 157-74.

Freedle R.O. (ed.) 1979. New Directions in Discourse Processing. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Givon T. 1983. 'Topic continuity. An introduction' in Givon (ed.) 1983: 1-41.

Givon T. (ed.) 1983. Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Linguistic Study. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goffman E. 1981. Forms of Talk. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Grimes J.E. (ed.) 1978. Papers on Discourse. Arlington, Texas: SIL.

Hinds J. 1977. 'Paragraph structure and pronominalization'. Papers in Linguistics 10/1: 77-99.

Hinds J. (ed.) 1978. Anaphora in Discourse. Alberta: Linguistic Research, Inc.

Kay P. 1977. 'Language evolution and speech style' in Blount and Sanches (eds.) 1977: 21-33.

Labov W. 1972. Language in the Inner City. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Longacre R.E. 1980. 'An apparatus for the identification of paragragh types'. Notes on Linguistics 15: 5-22.

Longacre R.E. 1983. The Grammar of Discourse. New York: Plenum.

Mazzie C.A. 1987. 'An experimental investigation of the determinants of implicitness in spoken and written discourse'. Discourse Processes 10: 13-24.

Ochs E. and B.B. Schieffelin. (eds.) 1979. Developmental Pragmatics. New York: Academic Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Olson D.R. 1977. 'From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing'. Harvard Educational Review 47: 257-81.

Polanyi L. 1985. Telling the American Story: A Structural and Cultural Analysis of Conversational Storytelling. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rumelhart D. 1975. 'Notes on a schema for stories' in Bobrov and Collins (eds) 1975: 211-36.

Schank R. and R.P. Abelson. 1977. Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schiffrin D. (ed.) 1984. Meaning, Form and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Stark H.A. 1988. 'What do paragraph markings do?'. Discourse Processes 12: 275-303.

Tannen D. 1979. 'What's in a frame? Surface evidence for underlying expectations' in Freedle (ed.) 1979: 137-81.

Tannen D. 1980. 'A comparative analysis of oral narrative strategies' in Chafe (ed.) 1980: 51-87.

Tannen D. 1982. (ed.) Spoken and Written Language. Exploring Orality and Literacy. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen D. (ed.) 1986. Discourse in Cross-cultural Communication. Special issue of Text 6/2.

Tomlin R.S. (ed.) 1987. Coherence and Grounding in Discourse. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.